

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 7, 9-11, and 13-37 are currently pending. Claims 7, 9, 11, 13, and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-6, 8, and 12 were previously canceled.

Claims 7 and 26-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 7 has been amended to address this rejection.

Claims 9-10 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps. Claims 9 and 13 have been amended to address this rejection.

Claims 34-35 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Ryzin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,255,961).

Claims 7, 9-10, 11, 13-33, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Ryzin in view of Guo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,173,330).

The current amendment is being filed with a Request for Continued Examination.

Section 102(e) Rejections

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection that Van Ryzin anticipates claim 34. Specifically, Van Ryzin describes a remote control configured to communicate with a personal computer (PC) and with a number of audio-visual (A/V) devices in an A/V system. More specifically, the remote control is configured to exchange media information with the PC. The PC then exchanges the media information with the network to collect additional media information that the PC then provides to the remote control. The remote control does not collect the additional media information from the Network, but collects this information from the PC. See Van Ryzin at col. 5, lines 25-40 among numerous other places.

In contrast, claim 34 recites a method for programming a remote control, wherein the remote control is “web enabled,” and is configured to transfer media data “to a network” and then receive data back from the network. In the Van Ryzin system, only the PC is configured to communicate with the network; the remote control is configured to communicate with the PC and not the network. Therefore, the Van Ryzin remote control is not “web enabled,” is not

configured for "transferring the media data... to a network," and is not configured to receive data from a network, as recited in claim 34. Therefore, Van Ryzin fails to describe every recited limitation of claim 34. Therefore, Van Ryzin fails to anticipate claim 34.

Section 103(a) Rejections

Claim 7 as amended is not obvious over Van Ryzin in combination with Guo. Specifically, claim 7 has been amended to include similar limitations as that of claim 34, which was distinguished from Van Ryzin above. As described above, in the Van Ryzin system, only the Van Ryzin PC is configured to communicate with the network; the Van Ryzin remote control is configured to communicate with the PC and not the network. Guo does not make up for this deficiency of Van Ryzin. Specifically, Guo discusses a programming channel (e.g., for television programs) configured to provide a program guide to a remote control. The program guide is transmitted in the programming channel at a continuously low rate to the remote control. Nowhere does Guo discuss a network-enabled remote control that is configured to receive a program guide from a network. Therefore, Guo fails to make up for the deficiencies of Van Ryzin. Therefore, Van Ryzin and Guo fail to render amended claim 7 obvious.

Independent claims 13 and 20 have been amended to include similar limitations to those of amended claim 7 distinguished from Van Ryzin and Guo above. Therefore, for at least the same reasons Van Ryzin and Guo fail to render amended claim 7 obvious, Van Ryzin and Guo similarly fail to render amended claims 13 and 20 obvious.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/804,624
Amdt. sent February 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2004

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Rodney C. LeRoy
Reg. No. 53,205

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
RCL:cmm
60377147 v1